

REMARKS

Claims 1 – 16 are pending. Claims 1 and 16 are currently amended. Claims 21 – 56 are canceled without prejudice. Applicants respectfully request reconsideration of the claims in view of the above amendments and the following remarks.

The office action rejected all pending claims under § 103(c) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent 5,832,497 issued to Taylor (“Taylor”) in view of U.S. Patent 5,884,270 issued to Walker et al. (“Walker”).

Regarding claim 1, the Examiner points to Walker at col. 16, lines 60-67; col. 17, lines 8-30; and col. 18, lines 1-10 as teaching, *inter alia*, communicating an identifier to the candidate, receiving the identifier from an outside user, and distributing to the outside user an electronic document including the candidate's data record and an electronic authentication of the contents of the data record, specifically with reference to. Applicants respectfully disagree. These passages cited by the Examiner relate to a protocol by which a requestor may anonymously request and be granted access to party data through an intermediary (i.e., the central controller 200) using permission certificates. The passage at col. 16, line 60, makes it clear that the purpose of the protocol is to obtain a party's authorization to release party data. The protocol itself is described at col. 17, lines 6-46. In summary, the protocol involves the central controller receiving a request from a requestor (step 1), obtaining authorization from the party to release the party data (steps 2-6), and upon receiving the party's authorization, transmitting the party's (unverified) data to the requestor (step 7).

The presently claimed invention does not require such an elaborate protocol. Instead, the candidate explicitly grants authorization to the outside user when the “outside user [] received the identifier directly or indirectly from the candidate.” Embodiments of the invention essentially replace steps 2-6 (and the decryption and verification components of step 7) with receipt of the identifier associated with the data record. The candidate provides the identifier to the requestor, so the requestor has already been given the candidate's authorization to access the data.

Further, in accordance with claim 1, an electronic document including the data record and an electronic authentication of the contents of the data record is distributed upon receipt of the identifier associated with the data record. Even assuming, *arguendo*, that the party data referred

to in Walker's protocol is akin to a data record, Walker does not transmit the party data upon receipt of a unique record identifier from the requestor but rather transmits the party data in response to a request to verify certain party data, and Walker makes no mention of transmitting an electronic document including both the party data and an electronic authentication of the contents of the party data, as is required by claim 1.

Thus, Walker fails to disclose a method in which a data record identifier is communicated to the candidate who provides the data to be verified, the identifier is received from an outside user who received the identifier from the candidate, and an electronic document including the data record and an electronic authorization of the contents of the data record is distributed to the outside user, as required by claim 1. As the Examiner has noted that Taylor does not teach this limitation either, the applicants therefore respectfully submit that claim 1 is allowable over Taylor and Walker both alone and in combination.

Claim 16 includes claim elements similar to those in claim 1. For the reasons stated above, the applicants respectfully submit that claim 16 is also allowable over Taylor and Walker both alone and in combination.

Claim 16 was further amended to change "digital storage medium" to "storage arrangement" for consistency.

All pending claims are believed to be in a form suitable for allowance. Therefore, the application is believed to be in a condition for allowance. The applicants respectfully request early allowance of the application. The applicants request that the Examiner contact the undersigned if it will assist further examination of this application.

The applicants petition for a two month extension of time. In the event that a further extension is needed, this conditional petition of extension is hereby submitted. The applicants request that deposit account number 19-4972 be charged for any fees that may be required for the timely consideration of this application.

DATE: September 2, 2008

Respectfully submitted,

/ Jeffrey T. Klayman, #39,250 /

Jeffrey T. Klayman
Registration No. 39,250
Attorney for Applicants

Bromberg & Sunstein LLP
125 Summer Street
Boston, Massachusetts 02110-1618
Tel: (617) 443-9292
Fax: (617) 443-0004

1525B/00116 892313.2